

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)		2. REPORT TYPE Technical Papers		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 20px; display: inline-block;">Please see attached</div>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER In-House	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 62500F	
				5d. PROJECT NUMBER 3058	
				5e. TASK NUMBER 00E7	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER 549983	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048					
8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT					
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory (AFMC) AFRL/PRS 5 Pollux Drive Edwards AFB CA 93524-7048					
10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)					
11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S NUMBER(S) AFRL-PR-ED-TP-1998-150					
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center; font-size: 2em;">20030312 052</div>					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT A	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON Leilani Richardson
a. REPORT Unclassified	b. ABSTRACT Unclassified	c. THIS PAGE Unclassified			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) (661) 275-5015

E7

MEMORANDUM FOR IN-HOUSE PUBLICATIONS

FROM: PROI (TI) (STINFO)

9 Jul 98

SUBJECT: Authorization for Release of Technical Information, Control Number: AFRL-PR-ED-TP-1998-150
Dave Perkins "Reusable Orbit Transfer Vehicle Propulsion Technology Considerations"
AIAA Slides (Statement A)



Reusable Orbit Transfer Vehicle Propulsion Technology Considerations

Dave Perkins

**Air Force Research Laboratory
Propulsion Directorate
Edwards Research Site
Edwards AFB, CA**



ROTV: The Interest

- **Cost of Space Access is Prohibitive: ~\$10B/Yr for World**
 - Expendable Launch Hardware limits potential cost reduction
 - Upper Stages and Orbit Transfer Vehicles are Big Cost Element
 - ~25% of total launch service to destination orbits
- **The key claim is 10X cost reductions thru Reusability**
 - ROTVs amortize their cost over many missions
 - Benefit of large number of reuses at marginal cost
- **ROTVs enable Space Salvage via Space Tug**

ROTV Concept of Operations

Ground Based



1. ROTV & PL are Integrated on the Ground
2. Propellant Loaded before Launch
3. RLV performs LEO Insertion
4. ROTV (with PL) Deployed from RLV
5. ROTV transfers to Destination Orbit
6. PL Deployment &/or Pickup
7. ROTV Return to LEO
8. Rendezvous w RLV: Safe and Vent
9. ROTV Capture and Storage
10. Reentry, Land, ROTV Removal
11. Process for Next Mission

ROTV Concept of Operations

Space Based



1. PL & Propellant (in flight Dewar) Loaded into RLV
 2. RLV launch and rendezvous with ROTV
 3. On-Orbit Propellant Transfer
 4. PL transfer from RLV to ROTV
 5. ROTV transfers to Destination Orbit
 6. PL Deployment &/or Pickup
 7. ROTV Return to LEO
 8. Safe, Vent and Self-Maintain On-Orbit
- On-Orbit Maintenance must be separately planned & performed



Space Based Vs. Ground Based

- Space Based has fewer operations, however
 - Requires dewars that are RLV flight hardware
 - On-orbit maintenance with very good health monitoring
 - 1 pound per sensor x many hundreds of sensors
 - On-Orbit propellant transfer
 - Low weight with High transfer efficiency
 - Must limit number of replenishable fluids in SB ROTV
 - PL transfer w autonomous operations will scare PLs
 - Orbital Inclination Limitations
 - Orbital plane changes are just too expensive
 - That's why LVs Launch to PL inclinations when possible
 - Limits number of missions that SB ROTV can capture
- Ground Based is better

CA



ROTVs: Some Cautions

- **SB or GB ROTVs require Reusable Launch Vehicles**
 - RLV is a Giant Horse necessary for ROTV Cart
- **Economic viability demands large # of ROTV reuses**
 - High mission success reliability is essential
 - Large ROTV development scope (cost & sched) concern
- **ROTV LEO return leg uses propellant that reduces PL**
 - Demands high ISP propulsion
 - A pound of propellant in LEO is worth ~\$5000 today
 - Limits chemical systems to lower energy missions
- **ROTVs & Dewars are sized for largest mission**
 - Limits RLV volume available for PL
- **ROTV interfaces w PL will need to be very general OR ROTV limited to specific markets**



ROTV Propulsion Technology

Chemical Propulsion

- **Storable Propulsion**

- Flexibility for long term on-orbit ops; No boil-off
- Use limited to LEO and low MEO constellations
- Relatively dense propellants limit volume problems

- **Cryogenic Propellants**

- Higher ISP allows full MEO access, better PL fractions
- Lower propellant density coupled with insulation req'm't
 - Heavier tanks & dewars and Smaller payload volumes

- **In either case, high ISP and low stage mass needed**

- Low thrust pump fed engines; closed engine cycles
- Light weight integrated tank, structure, and insulation



ROTV Propulsion Technology

Solar Thermal Propulsion

- ISP limited by working fluid, but very high
 - H₂ to ~1000 sec; NH₃ to 450 sec
 - Can achieve all important Earth Orbits!
- Thrust is power (reflector size) limited to 10-100 lbf
 - Trip times to GEO from days to a couple of months
 - Thermal storage concepts raise thrust but lower ISP
 - Lowers trip times by factors of 2 to 5
- LH₂ creates many volume and handling issues
 - RLV payload bay volume constraint may be limiting
- Large integrated time in radiation belts
 - Heavier solar concentrators required
 - ~~PLs~~ ^{ADVERSE IMPACT ON} PLs will not be pleased _{DEVELOP}
- Need deployable concentrators that are restowable

PL3
1

ROTV Propulsion Technology

Electric Propulsion



- **ISP range of 1200 to 5000 sec and beyond**
 - Tremendous PL capability
- **Power limited thrust of under 1 lbf**
 - Forces less efficient continuous thrust spiral transfer
 - Trip times of months to a year or more
 - Limited to circular destination orbits
- **Propellants such as Xenon store well**
 - No volume constraint issues
- **Very long times in radiation belts**
 - Radiation hardened solar arrays needed
 - Power processor units should be shielded
 - PLs generally won't like radiation design constraint
- **Need light weight radiation resistant power arrays that are deployable and restowable**



Conclusions

- ROTVs enable space tugs and space salvage
 - RLV required to implement ROTV not yet well defined
- ROTV for Space Trans has a lot to prove to PLs
 - Esp. if RLV recurring cost becomes higher than advertised
- Ground based better than space based ROTV
 - Ground based ROTV useful for more missions
 - Less challenging technology required: Less risk to PL
- ROTV propulsion technologies to consider
 - Chemical rockets have limited mission capture
 - Solar thermal rockets capture most missions but LH2 issues
 - Electric has highest PL without volume constraint
 - Longest trip time, large PL radiation dose
 - Elliptical destination orbits not available
- All technologies require more \$ to enable ROTV!